DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 190 744 CE 025 220

AUTHOR Ashburn, Elizabeth A.
TITLE Motivation, Personality, and Work-Related Characteristics of Women in Male Dominated Professions. Ruth Strang Research Award Monograph Series: No. 2.
INSTITUTION National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Mar 77
NOTE 32p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Achievement Need: Adult Education: Attitudes: *Employed Women: Females: Intelligence: Job Satisfaction: Males: *Motivation: Nontraditional Occupations: *Personality: Personality Traits: *Professional Occupations: *Research Needs: Role Models: Self Concept: *Sex Differences: Sex Role: Socialization

ABSTRACT

This monograph reviews hypotheses about the motivations of women who choose male-dominated professions. Chapter 1 considers theory and empirical evidence regarding the personality and socialization patterns of those women who have chosen male-dominated professions. Discussion focuses on two types of internal motivation--achievement needs and need for autonomy and individuation--and three types of external inducements--the enrichment hypothesis, role models and role support, and attitudes of significant males. Chapter 2 summarizes available data concerning the personality characteristics of women in male-dominated professions. These four factors are considered important: independence, feelings, intelligance, and ego-strength. Chapter 3 considers sex differences between professional men and women (commitment and ambition), reviews women's relationships with men on the job and with other women, and looks at differences found in kinds of job duties, workstyles, and job satisfaction. Chapter 4 focuses on three research directions, necessary if women in professions, and those who have the potential to attain such positions, are to be understood and meaningfully counseled. They are research needs (1) to be related to theory, (2) to document trends, and (3) to evaluate vocational guidance and counseling interventions. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED190744

Motivation, Personality, and Work-Related Characteristics of Women in Male-Dominated Professions

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Elizabeth A. Ashburn

Volunteer Administrator
Mental Health Association
Winston-Salem, North Carolina

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
The National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Ruth Strang Research Award Monograph Series: No. 2

CE 025 220

National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors
1028 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

2

JUN 9 1980

The Ruth Strang Award

The National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors established a specific Research and Publication Fund in late 1970. Following Ruth Strang's death, the Association named this fund the Ruth Strang Research Fund to honor her memory. This monograph contains the paper which won the third annual Ruth Strang Award.

Professor Strang was internationally known and esteemed for her perceptive research and writing, especially in the fields of reading, gifted children, and student development work, and for her years of dedicated teaching. A substantial part of her career was spent at Columbia University Teachers College where hundreds of men and women were exposed to her good mind and her gentle person. On hearing of the award, one of her former students wrote, "I hope innovative approaches to counseling education constitute another way of expressing admiration for her work. It was in her course that I first found emphasis on the concept of empathy." She served for many years as the Editor of *The Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors* and contributed immeasurably to its stature.

Elizabeth A. Ashburn, the winner of the 1976 Ruth Strang Award, holds the B.A. degree, cum laude, from the University of New Hampshire. She is presently completing her doctoral degree in educational psychology at the State University of New York at Buffalo. Her professional interests and goals are in the area of applied research and teaching at the college level.

The subject of her paper, one of twenty-three submitted for the Award, grew out of personal struggles as she found herself headed toward becoming a professional female in a male-dominated profession.

Annette Gibbs, Chairperson
1976 Ruth Strang Award Committee

Additional copies of the monograph are available from the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors
1028 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.
Cost: $2.25. Payment must accompany orders of less than $5.00.

Copyright © 1977 by the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors
Printed in the United States of America

Contents

	Page
Introduction	
Chapter I	5
Motivation	6
Chapter II	
Personality	12
Chapter III	
Work-Related Characteristics	17
Chapter IV	
Research Needs	27
References	29

Introduction

For contemporary women in transition, the move from woman's traditional place to man's world continually produces a multitude of problems.[1] For women progressing a step further from the general world of work into male-dominated professions, the problems seem to sharpen. As several writers have noted (Janeway, 1971; Goode, 1973; Bunker & Seashore, 1975), these women who defy strong sex-role stereotypes and myths by entering male-dominated professions confront constant social and psychological disadvantages as a consequence of their role-breaking status.

There exists little theory for vocational counseling or career development of women to facilitate either guidance applications or research. Most research has concentrated on why women fail to enter such professions, rather than on the career development of those who do enter them. Some hypotheses, however, do exist about the motivations of women who choose male-dominated professions. It will be the focus of this paper to review those, and also to summarize what is known about the personality of such women. Finally, a comparison of these women with the men who work in professions will be made, including a discussion of inter and intra-sex relationships. Such a review will point to what still needs investigation before effective prediction, and more importantly, effective counseling of women in all stages of transition into such careers can occur.

[1]See Elizabeth Janeway, *Man's World, Woman's Place: A Study in Social Mythology.*

Chapter I
Motivation

The psychological-emotional conflicts which result from the clash between the stereotyped female personality and the personality type and behavior norms thought to be required from one with a serious commitment to a profession dominated by males (and by implication considered inappropriate for females) would seem to be great enough to have kept all but the most extraordinary women from a male-dominated arena. Komarovsky (1946, 1950) and Chesler (1973) have documented such conflicts and their consequences. Rossi (1965b) states that "those women who have entered the top professional fields have had to have extraordinary motivation, thick skins, exceptional ability, and some unusual pattern of socialization in order to reach their occupational destinations." Intelligence and education are apparently not sufficient conditions to predict professional achievement. This has been well-substantiated in a number of cases, particularly by Ginzberg (1966) in his study of Columbia graduate students, and by Sanford's study of Vassar students, which found that

> **Most young alumnae seemed happy to attune their lives to those of their husbands. The family unit and their husband's career took precedence over any ambitions they might have had.... The great majority were not at all concerned with what their roles would be 15 or 20 years later (Bardwick, 1971).**

In this section, theory and empirical evidence will be considered regarding the personality and socialization patterns of those women who have chosen male-dominated professions. There is little formal theory or research in this area of motivation for a high-status career. Bardwick states that "The motive to succeed... professionally is not single or simple" (1971). She reports that she, with 14 of her female graduate students, spent an evening discussing their personal backgrounds and goals in order to try to find a common pattern of motivation, and "We found none."

Internal Motivation: Achievement Needs

That a woman who desired and attained a position in a male-dominated profession would have high needs for achievement as well as be a high achiever seems almost a truism. As Rossi (1965a) found, the Pioneers (women college graduates whose long-range career goals were in masculine fields, N=245) were far more apt than the Homemakers (those who had no career goal other than housewife, N=700) to characterize themselves as "dominant" and "occupationally competitive." But

the motive to achieve in a male-dominated profession is more complicated than that. Horner's work (1969, 1972) on achievement motives in women is an example of an attempt to investigate the complications, but there are major problems with her findings (Tresemer, 1974), so that drawing conclusions from stories written by college students appears to have little generalizability to the occupational choice of adult women.

Bardwick (1971) discusses a range of issues relevant to the achievement motive in women, which she defines as a drive to excel with a high quality of effort, either in work or in traditional activities. This is one of the complications of the achievement motive: it may not be exhibited in an occupation, but in a traditionally female-typed role. The question then arises, are these two different kinds of high need for achievement, or can the role difference be accounted for by other factors, and if so, which ones?

Another complicating variable which Bardwick (1971) discusses is the affiliation motive and whether the achievement motive is diminished by it. She suggests what appears to be a trade-off for women between these two motives: the more women need to affiliate, the less they need to, or will, achieve, especially in a career. Rossi's study (1965a) provides some substantiation for this hypothesis. She found a strong contrast between single and married Pioneers: the single Pioneer (N=123) was twice as likely as the married Pioneer (N=122) to say that she is "occupationally competitive." Rossi concludes that one of the effects of marriage for the Pioneer woman might be a blunting of career striving. Bardwick attributes these lesser aspirations to internal forces rather than to the effects of the marriage institution: "My own hunch is that there are few middle-class American college women who have internalized a really independent motive to achieve and *will* achieve, social success be damned" (1971).

Hoffman puts the conflict between achievement and affiliation motives in a more positive light:

> The more diffuse achievement needs of women may make for greater flexibility in responding to the various possibilities that life offers at different stages in the life cycle. . . . A loss in intellectual excellence due to excessive affiliative needs, then, might seem a small price to pay if the alternative is a single-minded striving for mastery. But the present hypothesis suggests that women's affiliative needs are, at least in part, based on an insufficient sense of competence and as such they may have a compelling neurotic quality (1972).

She does, however, suggest another complication when she says that the need for affiliation may derive from unhealth sources. Nevertheless, the point is clear that the affiliation motive seems to affect the strength of the achievement motive.

Even though Horner's findings are inconclusive, they do make clear even another complication with the magnitude of the achievement motive. Competent women who would otherwise be highly achievement-oriented often inhibit such achievement behaviors in order to fit their internalized feminine stereotypic image (Horner, 1972). Horner states that the expectancy and value of the consequences of behaviors determine whether internalized dispositions will affect those behaviors: "Does, for instance, the girl care about the male competitor and possible rejection that may ensue if she does better than he does?" (1972). The degree of a woman's need to be congruent with the feminine image is probably affected in large part by another personality-motivational variable—the need for autonomy or individuation: this need may be another strong internal motive for choosing a male-dominated profession.

Internal Motivation: Need for Autonomy and Individuation

Bardwick makes some general observations about professional commitment in women, saying that those who have the most commitment also "have a feeling of independence, internalized criteria for esteem, and enough social alienation to be able to defer marriage until they have prepared themselves for their future vocations." She believes the "critical factor is the development of an independent self and an independent motive to achieve" (1971). The implication is that the greater the need for independence, the lesser will be the effect of the complicating influences on the achievement motive. In short, the manifestation of the achievement motive in women within the sphere of male-dominated professions may depend on a relatively strong drive for autonomy.

There are some data to support this view. Tangri (1972) studied the relationship between non-sex-typical occupational choices and background and personality of 200 senior college women; an extensive questionnaire was used, along with projective measures of need Achievement and Motive to Avoid Success. She found that the characteristics which most strongly differentiated Role Innovators (those women choosing male-dominated professions, N=65) from Traditionals (those choosing female-dominated professions, N=69) were the personality-motivational variables: "Innovators are more autonomous, individualistic, and motivated by internally imposed demands to perform to capacity."

Rossi (1965a) found similar characteristics among her Pioneers, who have had looser family ties and less intense personal relationships, and who were less dependent and nurturant than the Homemakers.

From findings on sex differences in medical students, Cartwright (1972) concludes that "A more differentiating sex motive is the category of individuation. Self-discovery, self-expression, and self-differentiation via work may be more significant for women since they are not obligated to work (i.e., they have other options)." She also mentions findings relevant to the motive for individuation reported by her elsewhere:

> Entering women medics scored significantly higher than males on the Achievement via Independence scale of the CPI, suggesting that female intellectual style as well as phenomenological reports reflect greater self-sufficiency and inner-directedness.

There seems to be enough evidence to conclude that for a woman to pursue a male-dominated profession, she in all probability must possess a very strong internal set of personal values and individual identity in order to overcome the numerous societal, environmental obstacles and the conflicts created by them. She almost surely has been reared in an environment which reinforced these personality-motivational variables. The next three sections encompass a discussion of these environmental and situational inducements and reinforcements for a serious career commitment.

External Inducements: The Enrichment Hypothesis

Major theoretical postulations and investigation of the unusual socialization patterns of women who choose male-dominated professions have been done by Almquist and Angrist (1970). They hypothesize two explanations for the "unconventional choosers" (those women who are career-oriented and choose something

other than feminine occupations). Their words most completely elaborate the alternatives:

> One is to suggest a kind of "deviance hypothesis," that the strongly career-oriented girl who chooses a masculine occupation is the product of social learning experiences which set her apart from her more conventional age-mates, experiences which lead her to develop a masculine image of herself and her adult role. Under this view the unusual chooser is a deviant from traditional standards. An alternative hypothesis is that the unconventional chooser is not so much a renegade as she is a product of additional enriching experiences which lead to a less stereotyped and broader conception of the female role. She does not reject the customary, time-honored duties of adult women, but sees these as augmented by work as an important feature of her adult life. This we refer to as the 'enrichment hypothesis.'

In support of the enrichment hypothesis, one of their questionnaire findings from a sample of 110 women students at a professionally-oriented university was that career-oriented women had more jobs and more different jobs than their non-career-oriented classmates. Graham (1970) suggests other support for the hypothesis in the number of women Ph.D.'s who have had close contact with another culture. She says that there is not much hard evidence, but that the number of women Ph.D.'s "is probably substantial . . . (who) have direct experience with another culture and presumably recognize a greater variety of options for women than the stereotype of middle America."

One aspect of the enrichment hypothesis is that these atypical choosers have had a number of role models to broaden their image of appropriate female behavior. Data on this follow.

External Inducements: Role Models and Role Support

A study discussed by Vetter (1973) found that the correlation of the number of "career successful women" and the number of female faculty from the achiever's undergraduate institutions was .953; the conclusion was drawn that the presence of professionally successful women influences in a positive manner the career aspirations of female students. It can hardly be inferred from this correlation that an increase in women faculty will produce an increase in the number of female students aspiring to highly professional positions. However, the logic underlying the conclusion appears reasonably sound; the more role models one has for a particular behavior, the more one would think the behavior appropriate and would tend to take on those behaviors.

There is evidence in support of this phenomenon. Rapoport and Rapoport (1971), in their study of over 500 women graduates of British universities, found a positive relationship between the female's occupational orientation and her mother's attitude toward work. Graham, in her review of data on academic women, says that there is a "substantial category of female Ph.D.'s. . . comprised of the daughters of professional women. . . the daughters of working mothers seem more inclined to pursue definite career patterns than other women are" (1970). In Tangri's study (1972), the data show that the Role Innovators did not identify with their fathers in preference to their mothers, but in many cases had mothers who were working, often in male-dominated professions. The findings of Almquist and Angrist (1970) are similar: atypical career choosers were twice as likely to have an employed mother, and approximately two-thirds of the atypical and career-salient women stated they had been significantly influenced by college professors or people in their field (while less than a third of the typical career-choosers reported such an influence).

External Inducements: Attitudes of Significant Males

While women choosing male-dominated professions have not been shown to have identified with their fathers, Rossi (1965a) did find that they found fatherly encouragement important, and probably more prevalent than encouragement from spouses. Fatherly encouragement becomes past tense, however, and for married women, the pursuit of a serious career is more than casually influenced by the husband. Lopate says that " 'The right husband' is one of the most common requirements set by women physicians themselves for combining a medical career with marriage" (1971). Bardwick (1971) agrees, suggesting that husbands must be confident enough in their own accomplishments so that their wives' professional commitment and achievement do not threaten them. The Pioneers in Rossi's study (1965a) reported, in a more practical vein, that "their career pursuits and living with a real husband rather than an idealized one a more difficult combination than they expected it to be."

Evidence of how much a husband's attitude can affect a woman's profession was found by Hawley (1972). In questioning 136 women at a state college, she found that those planning to enter a male-dominated profession were very concerned about male support, and that only 10% would pursue their career goals over the objections of significant men in their lives. Kashket et al (1974) asked married doctorates to indicate the degree to which spouses supported their professional aspirations. A higher percentage of women doctorates (82%, N=54) than men (70%, N=365) said that their spouses supported them enthusiastically. Ninety-six percent of the women doctorates were married to professionals, half of them in the same field, which perhaps accounts for such a high percentage of supportive spouses (although the evidence shows that if husbands are not supportive the wives do not usually continue in their careers). The important question of professional mobility was asked of the same sample, and the data show an ironic discrepancy. In analyzing the answers of only those who felt enthusiastically supported in their careers, of those willing to move, 95% of the women doctorates would move only if their husbands had found satisfactory employment, but of the male doctorates only 20% said that satisfactory jobs for their professional wives was a prerequisite (the remainder would move under any circumstances, or in hope that their wives would attain a job). Apparently "enthusiastic support" for a spouse's career commitment does not include, from the husband's perspective, retainment of the wife's professional position.

Summary and Conclusions

The most significant feature about women's motivation to achieve a position in a male-dominated profession is that its instance has been low; for numerous social and psychological reasons, most women have chosen to avoid these high-level jobs. For those women who have made such a commitment, the motivation seems to derive from two major personality-related sources. First, their personalities are highly oriented toward a need to achieve; this need is complicated by several other variables, including the degree of fear-of-success, the degree of the need for affiliation, and the strength of the individual's internalized stereotype of the feminine image.

A second major personality factor which serves as motivation toward such a career choice is a drive for autonomy. This appears highly related to the achieve-

ment motive to manifest itself in its purest form. Within the context of the complicating variables, the need to achieve would be easily suppressed if a woman did not have a strong desire to express her individuality.

The environmental factors appear to play an important role in whether women choose a male-dominated career. The hypothesis of an enriched socialization process postulates that such women have been exposed to broader experiences which lead to expectations for something other than the traditional feminine role in adulthood. Role models—mothers and teachers in particular—also have been shown to be important, and even more so, is whether fathers and husbands encourage and support the woman's career choice.

It should be obvious that the issue of motivation in women for a professional commitment is not a clear-cut one. Available data appear to raise more questions than answers. Some of the major variables which operate interactively in this particular category of career choice have been identified, but how they interact is still a question, as well as whether all the essentially significant ones have been noted. These unknowns are a consequence of a number of problems, among them: (1) The number of women choosing and maintaining a career in a male-dominated profession may have been so small that it has not been possible to determine any common patterns of motivation. (2) The motivational patterns appear far more individual and complicated than those for men, particularly because for women the situational and environmental variables influence the internal motivational factors to a greater extent. (3) Much of the evidence has been gathered on college/graduate student samples, and conclusions from it cannot be strictly generalized to those women who attain a position in a male-dominated profession and who keep that position. (4) Most theory and much research has been focused on why women have not been motivated to succeed in such careers. Whether the objectives of vocational choice theory are to predict women's choices or to influence them, it seems clear that a more precise and comprehensive approach must be taken in research on the motivational variables.

Chapter II

Personality

In *The Double Helix,* James Watson's story of the discovery of DNA, the personalities of two women are portrayed as polarities of the "normal" female. Janeway (1971) discusses them both. She says that a capable woman scientist on one of the research teams, Rosalind Franklin, was aggressively and cruelly attacked by Watson:

> She dressed badly, was stubborn in her views, harried her boss, wore her hair unbecomingly—in every way she was unsatisfactory.... Clearly Rosy, a normally good scientist, is abnormal as a woman.

The picture of the opposite, a "normal" woman, in relation to the scientific world, is a presentation of Odile Crick, the wife of one of the scientists:

> Though Odile could not follow what we were saying, she was obviously cheered by the fact that Francis [her husband] was about to bring off his second triumph within the month. If this course of events went on, they would soon be rich and could own a car. At no moment did Francis see any point in trying to simplify the matter (of their scientific endeavor) for Odile's benefit. Ever since she had told him that gravity went only three miles into the sky, this aspect of their relationship was set.

These two personalities as presented by Watson are paradigms of the common attitude toward women, not only in the scientific world, but also in the world of other professions which men dominate. As Janeway points out, "if they are normal women, they are abnormal people; while if they are normal people with ordinary technical interests and capabilities, they are abnormal women. They can't be both" (1971). This is the prevalent stereotypic personality of women in male-dominated professions. Empirical evidence, meager as it is, does not entirely support such an image of "abnormality," either as women or as professionals.

There are little research data for a number of reasons. First, occupational choice theory is based primarily on personality characteristics for males. This approach has not been entirely successful for females; data suggest that even for males and females choosing similar occupations, the personality scores are not similar (Rose & Elton, 1971).

Second, many personality studies use college student samples (Rose & Elton, 1971; Maxwell & Gonzalez, 1972) which are not strictly generalizable to women who actually attain professional positions.

Third, major work on personality variables has been conducted by Ravenna Helson, but she concentrates on creative women, particularly mathematicians, and attempts to differentiate their characteristics from "other Ph.D.'s in math," who she assumes are not creative. This fails to tell much about the population of women who are professional mathematicians, especially since the "creatives" often do not have jobs (Helson, 1966, 1967, 1971).

Fourth, much of the personality description is off-the-cuff conjecture, given credibility by the author's supposed authority, or just by the mere fact of publication. Deutsch (1973) and Komisar (1970) are two examples of this. Conjectures such as those found in both these authors' descriptions of professional women, e.g.,

self-hatred, flattery, masculinization, lie at the core of stereotyping, and their danger lies in acceptance of them as truth rather than as hypothesis.

Last, as Rossi (1965b) pointed out, "There have been no detailed psychological studies of women scientists in any way comparable to those of men scientists," and there are none for women in any other of the male-dominated professions. The most intensive research on males was done by Anne Roe on famous physicists and biologists in the 1940s.

These are some of the reasons so little is known about the personality characteristics of professional women. It is easy to see why personality stereotypes such as Watson's prevail, for they sound more authoritative and conclusive than the few established facts.

Some major data in this area of personality come from research on psychologists, biologists and chemists by Bachtold and Werner (1970, 1971, 1972). In the first study, in an effort to identify personality factors associated with these women, they mailed the 16 PF questionnaire along with a request for information on areas of vocational interest, major activities, and number of publications to women APA members who had a doctoral degree, were associated with a college or university, and were born in 1910 or earlier (N=124). Predictably, this group of female psychologists differed from the norm group of women on 14 of the 16 personality factors (the exceptions were ego strength and self-control). Along with college women, they scored lower than average in superego strength; the investigators pointed out that the successful intellectual person tends to be less judgmental of self and others.

Bachtold and Werner summarized the personality profile of their academic woman psychologist as

> an introspective person, with an imaginative inner mental life. Although she enjoys working alone and is independent and self-sufficient, she is ready to take a chance and welcomes new experiences. Self-assertive, she is also insightful regarding herself and others, and not inclined to moralize. Without rigidity in standards, she is flexible in viewpoint and adaptable. Emotionally stable and with adequate self-control, she also seems fairly free from general anxiety.

These seem to be rather far-reaching generalizations to make about a group of women who have made personality tests their occupation; it would be difficult to believe that over their long careers these women would not have had personal experience with the test they took for this study, or at least have clearly understood the dynamics of such a test. This would seem to make the validity of such results questionable.

In another study, Bachtold and Werner (1971) compared women psychologists with a group of "successful academic men" from an earlier study by Cattell and Drevdahl.[1] There was a profile pattern similarity coefficient of .70, with both groups differing from the general population in aloofness (A-), intelligence (B+), assertiveness (E+), seriousness (F-), lack of rigidity (G-), adventuresomeness (H+), sensitivity (I+), adaptability (L-), self-confidence (O-), radicalness (Q_1+), and self-sufficiency (Q_2+). They found relatively large differences between the males and females; women were higher on intelligence, and lower in ego strength and will power. The women were also found to have a tendency to be less serious and more

[1]Cattell, R.B. & Drevdahl, J.E. A comparison of the personality profiles of eminent researchers with those of eminent teachers and administrators and the general population. *British Journal of Psychology*, 1955, 46, 248-261.

rigid in internal standards, and to be considerably more radical than the successful men.

The most productive women (N=30, 26-275 publications) differed from the least productive (N=30, 0-1 publications) on only one factor (A). They "preferred contemplation over social relationships, liked working alone, intellectual companionship, and rigor of thought."

Women biologists and chemists (N=146, ages 45-60) were mailed the 16 PF questionnaire in another study (Bachtold & Werner, 1972). They were found to be more serious, radical, confident, dominant, intelligent, and adventurous than women in the general population, and less sociable, group-dependent, and sensitive. They compared these profiles of women scientists with those of men scientists in a previous study, using sten scores; the comparison yielded a coefficient of .67 ($p < .01$). Both groups were found to be aloof, dominant, serious, confident, and resourceful. The men were more serious than the women scientists, less affected by feelings, more trusting, and more controlled, while the women were more resourceful, more conscientious, and less conservative. On Factor I both groups scored in the opposite direction from the stereotypic sex norms; the men scientists were more sensitive, the women, more tough-minded.

A study of freshman medical students (Cartwright, 1972) found personality characteristics closely related to Bachtold and Werner's data. Self-report measures (the Adjective Checklist and the California Psychological Inventory) were administered to 90 women and 718 men. It was concluded from the results that the women medical students were more willing than men to express their feelings and admit weaknesses, and more likely to view themselves as totally committed to their goals; they were less likely than men to endorse extremes of dominant and aggressive behavior. No sex differences were found on the personality scales relating to interpersonal effectiveness (dominance, sociability, self-acceptance, and sense of well-being). But the women did score higher than the men students on the scales of responsibility, tolerance, and two of the three achievement scales.

The investigator concluded that results of both measures confirmed the hypothesis that female medical students, in comparison with male colleagues, tended to show more sensitivity to relationship values, more general acceptance of feelings, and a greater alertness to moral and ethical issues; they also placed greater value on independence and individuality than did the males or educated women in general. Although this study sampled students, it may have some relevance for personality characteristics of professional women; perhaps the differences and traits found in this sample, after the attrition in medical school, might be even more pronounced in women who have attained full professional status.

Summary and Conclusions

Although documentation is by no means extensive, it appears from available data that the personality characteristics of women in male-dominated professions center on four important factors: independence, feelings, intelligence, and ego-strength. These women are more independent than norm women; they are not as sociable or as "groupy," and they are more radical and adventurous. This trait is a logical one for such women to possess, since they pursue an "abnormal" role for women. Independence, then, would almost be a prerequisite trait for such a career choice. A number of questions can be raised regarding this trait, since the personality measures used in research are so general. It would be interesting to know more

specifically the nature of this independence. Does it manifest itself equally in both thinking and behavior? Does it cause emotional conflict, or is it accepted by the woman? Does its strength vary from one situation to another, or is it relatively equal across mother, wife and work spheres? Is it stronger in women who choose, for example, management careers as opposed to those in medicine? If it is different from the professional male's independence characteristics, how? From a developmental perspective, how was this trait fostered?

A personality characteristic usually associated with women is a sensitivity to feelings; professional women seem to have not lost this trait, at least in relation to their male colleagues. This is an important point, since the stereotype would have us cling to an image of insensitivity (Bunker & Seashore, 1975). What needs to be studied is how the woman's tough-mindedness and independence combine with sensitivities and acceptance of feelings. It seems important for achievement-oriented women not to deny their skills in emotional expression and value on developing relationships since this is perhaps an area in which they could make a great contribution to the working environment. In the study by Fairlie (1971) there is agreement with this idea.

That these professional women are more intelligent, more resourceful, more conscientious, than the population of their male colleagues is a testament only to the fact that those few women with the greatest ability have been the ones able to surmount the social and institutional barriers to their achievement.

Where professional women are lacking in relation to males is in their ego-strength; they are less assured and have less will power. This would be surprising in light of their intelligence and independence, except that it must be remembered that these women operate "out of context," so to speak. As a minority from both the female and professional perspectives, with frustrations and self-doubts which that status implies, women could hardly be expected to have ego strength equal to that of men. Natalie Shainess (1973) puts it this way:

> **Perhaps the only change I see necessary in women generally, and especially in medicine and psychiatry, is that they internalize their superegos. This means giving up male standards, judgments, and views of what is permissible for them. I mean that they must stop yielding to male paternalism. It means daring to be autonomous and self-assertive without fear of criticism .... It means being *self-critical* about interpersonal and developmental processes.**

On the whole, the data are loose and sparse and allow for little more than very tentative generalizations about personality characteristics. What seems to be necessary is thorough investigation of the type done by Roe (1952) on male personalities. A primary need for such investigation stems from the personality stereotypes which still prevail and which affect professional women and potentially professional women, as well as their relationships with others. The image of the "masculine," aggressive, dominating, insensitive, and probably less than competent woman in a man's world surely discourages many young women from a profession. For the woman who is already a professional, the extent to which such stereotypes affect their work because of the misconceptions of their clients, colleagues or superiors is only a conjecture. The degree to which such stereotypic images still obtain, and the degree to which they affect potential career choice, working relationships, and work productivity needs to be investigated. Also, the similarities between the professional woman and the concept of the "feminine" woman (if that can be agreed

upon in any systematic fashion) should be studied; this would be particularly helpful in reducing psychological strain caused by perceived sex-role inappropriateness.

Another question goes beyond the professional woman to the broader concept of the achieving woman. What are the personality differences, if any, between the woman who achieves in a male-dominated arena, and one who does so in a female-dominated profession? And how do they differ from the competent, achievement-oriented woman in a volunteer capacity? Perhaps there are few differences in personality among these three groups, but many situational differences; this hypothesis, if proved true, would again be helpful in reducing public and private emotional strain over choosing what has been an atypical role for achieving women.

Just as all working women cannot be lumped into one category for study, the outstanding, the most productive and creative professional women need to be separated from those who achieve at a "normal" level. A further distinction can be made between those who have relatively continuous work patterns, and those who choose to work only part time, and to not work for extended periods. Those women who stop their professional careers for a length of time may differ significantly in personality from those who do not, and they may or may not be similar to those women who begin a career in later life.

Finally, it would be important to know if professional women perceive any personality differences and similarities between themselves and other groups of significant people in their lives, and if so, whether those differences affect them greatly, and how they cope with those effects.

A most crucial thrust for research in the area of personality of women in male-dominated professions is to establish actual differences which tend to characterize this group, as well as similarities between them and their male colleagues and other non-professional women. Perhaps as a consequence those elements of the stereotype of such women which are misconceived and which cause both personal and professional conflicts may begin to be revised.

Chapter III

Work-Related Characteristics

According to Maccoby and Jacklin (1974), there are but four well-established, general psychological differences between males and females. Girls have greater verbal ability than boys, while boys tend to have greater visual-spatial and mathematical abilities, and higher levels of aggression. The only characteristic they think is related to women in management positions—and this may tentatively be generalized to women in other top professional positions—is aggression (Jacklin & Maccoby, 1975). The issue they consider crucial is whether aggression and concern for dominance are useful or necessary in specific professional positions. Since "there is no evidence of sex differences in achievement motivation, in risk taking, in task persistence, or in other related skills. . . there is no reason to believe there are sex differences in aggressive leadership" (Jacklin & Maccoby, 1975).

To answer their concern, they suggest (with documentation) that competitiveness and dominance may not be effective for productive management; that may also be true as well for those in other top positions. Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) do admit, however, that research, because of its sparseness or ambiguity, does not answer the questions of sex differences regarding timidity, activity levels, competitiveness, dominance, compliance, and nurturance; all these characteristics could be related to careers and workstyles. The reality that emerges from the data on professional women is that some sex differences do exist currently; women relate to their jobs and to their colleagues in a manner somewhat different from men.

These differences are considered in this section. A key issue will be women's commitment to their work and their ambition. Secondly, their relationships with men on the job and with other women will be reviewed. Then, a brief look at differences found in kinds of job duties, workstyles, and in job satisfaction will be made.

The literature is replete with statistics comparing men and women professionals on such criterion variables as productivity, rank, promotion, salary, and time spent working (Kreps, 1971). These kinds of "status" studies predominate in that they are relatively simple to conduct and contain measurable criteria. They are the primary force behind the discrimination issues, and they are leading indicators of what may be far more complicated issues, such as sex differences in career ambition. A few of the general findings are stated to present the flavor contained in much of the survey literature. For example, women Ph.D.'s have been found to publish less than men of comparable jobs and rank (Bernard, 1964; Rossi, 1965a; Centra, 1973), but married women Ph.D.'s publish as much as single women (Rossi, 1965a; Ferber & Loeb, 1973). Men doctorates and medical doctors have been found to

work longer hours than women in respective positions (Phelps, 1968; Kashket, 1974), just as women professionals, in general, work fewer hours than men (Epstein, 1971b). Women doctorates and women lawyers earn less than men, and salary differences increase with seniority (Bernard, 1964; Jacobs, 1972; Ferber & Loeb, 1973; Kashket, 1974). Married women professors have lower salaries than single women professors (Ferber & Loeb, 1973). Women doctorates are more likely to be research associates, while men are more likely to be full professors; women are highly unlikely to be department heads (Graham, 1970; Ferber & Loeb, 1973; Kashket, 1974). The academic rank of women is inferior to that of men in all kinds of institutions (Bernard, 1964). Such facts appear endless, and, although they are very important in many cases, they are superficialities within the context of this paper. Some of the more complex issues, which may be both causes and consequences of the statistics mentioned above, will be considered here.

Commitment and Ambition

The major perception regarding career commitment and ambition to achieve in women professionals is that women tend to have neither, at least relative to men. Women are seen to have "job" rather than "career" orientations (Angrist, 1969), to be satisfied with lower ranks and lower salaries (Jacobs, 1972; Cartwright, 1972), and to be unambitious about attaining leadership positions (Poloma & Garland, 1971). According to Epstein (1971b), "The ideal professional is one whose work dominates the other parts of his life." One consequence of the discrepancy between the concept of the ideal professional and the perception of women professionals is that women's commitment to careers is called into question.

This perception is apparently well-documented. Bernard (1964) concluded from reviewing several earlier studies on women in academia that the job for these women was secondary to marriage and family. Rossi (1965a) reported that of all the women in her study, Traditionals and Pioneers included, the majority expected family relationships to be the primary source of satisfaction in their lives; the only exception was among the unmarried Pioneers (N=123), 40 percent of whom expected their career to be the primary source of life satisfaction (fewer than 10% of the married Pioneers, N=122, felt this way). This lack of primary commitment to careers is further suggested by the fact that two-thirds of both the single and married Pioneers (N=245) agreed with the statement that "It is more important for a woman to help her husband's career than to have one herself."

Poloma and Garland's research on 53 professional couples provides data for similar conclusions: most professional women have jobs rather than careers. They found as Rossi did, that for the majority of the women doctors, lawyers, and professors in their study, the highest priority was for the wife and mother role, and that they simply did not want the demands, commitments, and responsibilities of a full career. Of those women that the researchers defined as having a career, most originated their careers in part-time or volunteer positions; they also found a few who moved from "career" to "job" depending on their family's life cycle.

A study of female law school students corroborates these findings. Jacobs (1972), in an interview survey including 35 women law students, found that the women perceived their professional role and identity as somewhat subordinate to their pre-existing identities as women, wives and mothers.

Another major study which documented this lower commitment is one on a British sample conducted by Fogarty, Rapoport and Rapoport (1971). Part of their study investigated five occupations for male-female workstyle differences: architects, managers in two large firms, company directors, and people in the B.B.C. and the Administrative Civil Service. These five occupations were chosen because

they illustrated between them the major types of environment in which the possibility exists for a high-level career.

Findings of these "occupational studies" were marginal differences between men and women as these authors interpreted them. Supporting data in both the Rossi and Poloma and Garland studies was the general finding that the women tended to have wider interests than men, and to be less motivated to reach the uppermost levels of power and money. Their ambitions tended to be "horizontal" rather than "vertical." The women were also found to be less forceful and competitive than the men in their work and in pursuing their careers. The authors (since the study was a policy-oriented one) were careful to make the point that the findings may or may not be permanent ones, since these differences may have been caused by lack of opportunity, unfamiliarity due to lack of vocational guidance and counseling, and family commitments. They raised a practical and important question regarding women's commitment of

> how women, and especially married women, can be expected to make enough of their time available at the right times to earn promotions or to enable them to fill senior posts. . . . Women's share falls far short of men's. Outright discrimination accounts for part of the difference, but only for a diminishing part. It certainly cannot account for the fact that women's share of senior posts has tended to level off at a time when discrimination has been decreasing.

Again, the question of whether this lesser ambition and commitment is a valid sex difference can be raised; i.e., the differences appear to occur as a consequence of differential vocational socialization processes for males and females, rather than as a consequence of any inherent differences. The fact remains, however, that they do exist currently. A more important question may be, in a practical sense, whether or not the women are satisfied with a lesser, more devalued psychological and sociological status. Would a large number of them, in fact, prefer to be more committed, more ambitious, spend more time working, achieve more prestigious positions?

Poloma and Garland's research, along with Rossi's seem to indicate that women professionals are satisfied with their commitment status. Centra's data (1973) appear to support this also. Of the women doctorates working full-time (N=1187), 12 percent preferred to be working less; only 17 percent of the women working half-time (N=101) would prefer full-time employment. But with the changing conditions in society, such as the emergence of good day care facilities, it may be that the achievement-commitment orientation of women also may be changing. A related question can be directed toward men. Centra (1973) found that 9 percent of the full-time male doctorates (N=1527) preferred to be working less. Would it be possible that with a lessening societal pressure to achieve, men would look more to the family and less to their careers for major life satisfaction? All these questions need answering and re-answering with current data, so that the phenomenon of career commitment can be established as either a changing trend within individual life cycles, or within a social cycle which is moving toward androgyny, or within a preferred role mandated by gender.

One of the problems in studying this aspect is the definition of the concepts of commitment, ambition and achievement. An example of how research can be wasted is Harmon's study (1970) which attempted to differentiate women who were committed to their careers and those who were not. The definition of a *career-committed* woman was one who had a "usual occupation," whether or not she was currently employed; the *non-committed* were those who had no usual career. This definition failed to distinguish between jobs and careers, or between

women wanting to work and those who had to work, or between women in different types of occupations, since the sample was chosen from those who had high scores on the Social Worker scale of the SVIB. As would be expected, the attempt to predict commitment thus defined, on the basis of SVIB scores, produced no useful results. Achievement and ambition need also to be clearly defined. Need achievement is different from actual achievement, and fear-of-success expressed in stories written by experimental subjects cannot be equated with actually not succeeding, or making a decision to succeed only to a certain level. Being ambitious and acting in an ambitious manner are also two different concepts, not necessarily correlated.

Research on these similar phenomena needs to define in some consistent manner the concepts in order to obtain meaningful results. A life which has a balance between career and family does not necessarily indicate a lower commitment toward one's work. A lower level of competitiveness may even indicate a more substantive orientation. For example, in one study of scientists (Bernard, 1964), women tended more than men to explain their productivity from a non-competitive approach. Almost 40 percent of the men (N=28) but only one-fourth of the women (N=28) gave the "publish or perish" policy or a strongly competitive atmosphere at their institutions as motivation for their productivity. On the other hand, 75 percent of the women said that "fascination with a problem" or a preference for research was a reason, while only about half the men (48%) said the same.

Relationship to Other Women

The one characteristic which stands out in the meager data on relationships of professionally successful women to other women is aloofness. The most popular and perhaps most definitive data on this characteristic were presented in *Psychology Today* (Staines et al, 1974) and labeled the "Queen Bee syndrome." In response to a questionnaire designed by Tavris (1974), *Psychology Today* received 20,000 replies from both sexes. The Queen Bees were defined as having "both *professional* success (a high-status job with good pay) and *social* success (popularity with men, attractiveness, a good marriage). The true Queen Bee has made it in the 'man's world' of work, while running a house and family with her left hand. 'If I can do it without a whole movement to help me,' runs her attitude, 'so can all those other women.' "

The study's findings on the Queen Bee all point to the aloof, individualistic and even hostile feelings successful professional women have toward other women. The majority of them believe that "women have only themselves to blame for not doing better in life" and that women can best overcome discrimination by "working individually to prove their abilities," not by joining organizations. The study also found that the Queen Bee who is successful in a male-dominated field does not identify with women as a class; instead, she identifies with the specific male colleagues who are her reference group.

Gordon and Strober (1975), in one of their vignettes at the end of the book, reveal a woman who, on the way to a directorship in a government position, experienced one aspect of the Queen Bee syndrome. In one of her personal observations, she said:

> **Women interviewers are prone to be harder on the older female applicant wanting to enter the management field.**
>
> **I kept trying to figure this one out, because I had thought it would really be the men who would give me a hard time.**

> But the women. Why the veiled hostility? I finally concluded that they felt threatened or undermined by my wanting to enter management at a higher level than their points of entry.... Why had I any right early on to expect something so long in coming to them?

An English professor at Rutgers University, Adrienne Rich (1975), comments on the lack of women's support for each other, at least within the university hierarchy. She says that this fragmentation among women occurs because women are defined by their relationships to the men in power, rather than to the other women in the hierarchy. This assumption by women—that achievement and success depend on pleasing and identifying with the men in power—has led to destructive competition and "invisible demoralization...(which) work constantly against the intellectual and emotional energies of the woman." Bunker and Seashore (1975) would label such behaviors as collusion; they say that women continue their collusion because not to do so would rob them of the reinforcement to their self-esteem that such dependent behavior affords.

One exception to this syndrome was found in a study by Epstein (1973) on 31 black women in the professions of law, medicine, dentistry, university teaching, journalism, and public relations.

> Black women professionals also seem to have higher regard for each other than white women professionals. I encountered far less self-hatred among them than among white women lawyers interviewed earlier. The latter shared the (male) negative stereotypes of women lawyers as excessively aggressive and masculine. The black women interviewed seemed to have a more matter-of-fact attitude toward their sister professionals; they never indicated doubts about the competence of other women, and some said they favored women colleagues because they were more reliable and more willing to work than the men they knew. Few white women professionals favored other women professionals.

This exception may reveal what happens when women do not depend on men for self-esteem, and when they establish their identities instead within the context of their work and their womanhood.

Relationship to Men

Two characteristics pervade the relationship of professional women toward their male colleagues: the stroking function assigned to women and the issue of sexuality.

Bernard (1971) includes an entire chapter on the stroking or supportive function; she says it

> is more pivotal than the others, more central, more pervasive in its influence, more subtle, and so more difficult to evaluate in terms of costs and benefits. It has rarely been formally articulated and has never been the concern of policy. It has been too deeply embedded in the fabric of groups and societies to elicit general comment or public discussion.

This behavior, which she says has been the specialization of women in most of the world's cultures, is defined by showing solidarity, raising others' status, giving help and rewards, agreeing, concurring, complying, understanding, and passively accepting. Stroking is expected of all women in all aspects of life, but it has particular characteristics and consequences for professional women.

Bernard, to document this phenomenon in the professional world, quotes from

an article entitled "Some Observations on the Function of Women Sociologists at Sociology Conventions" (Mintz, G.F., pseudonym, *American Sociologist*, 1967, 2). The author describes an encounter between two colleagues, in which the male conventioneer has sought out a casual female friend for conversation. He dominates the talk by listing his year's achievements: research notes, book reviews, monographs, projects, etc. The woman only listens before they depart. The author explains that such a discussion could not have occurred between two male colleagues, because after listing and being rewarded for his achievements, he would have to listen to and reward his friend in return.

> By that time, his own psychic gains would have been negated. He would leave the situation experiencing as much psychic stress as when he entered it. But, in selecting a female colleague he can have his catharsis, the enjoyment of feminine companionship, and best of all no requirement or even expectation that he reward in kind a similar recitation of accomplishments from his colleague.

The point is made that a woman colleague's appreciation is worth more than that of his wife, or of any other woman who is not trained in his area, since she has been educated to judge the worth of ideas and research.

Another similar incident was reported by Bernard elsewhere (The second sex and the cichlid effect, *Journal of NAWDC*, 1967, 31). At the end of dinner, one of the professional women comments to another about their male colleagues:

> 'Did you notice that as we fed them questions and comments to draw them out, to give them a chance to tell us about their achievements, not once did they do the same for you and me?' 'Yes,' replied her companion. . . . They laughed together—too successful, too reconciled, too experienced to care.

The costs of such behaviors being expected primarily from women are subtle and widespread. Bernard says that the professional woman pays in her achievement; psychologically, women in such encounters described above, unless they *have* been very successful, feel that their achievements are trivial. Also, the components of the stroking function (passive acceptance, compliance, agreement, etc.) are

> incompatible. . . with the kinds of activity demanded by the most prestigious jobs. If women must perform the stroking function, they are *ipso facto* disqualified for jobs that require fighting and competing and challenging. It is difficult to be supportive to a competitor or opponent.

Another cost is that stroking behavior is probably also incompatible with the kind of aggressive behaviors associated with creativity; Bernard agrees with Rossi (1965a) that we train women for failure by training them to be continually man-pleasing and supportive. Still another cost is an inability to distinguish between being supportive and being subservient; raising someone else's status may mean lowering one's own (Gordon & Strober, 1975).

As Bernard pointed out, this characteristic of the professional relationship has been little studied in any systematic way. A study of a mixed sex group of college students seems to be a step in this direction; it was found that women talked 30 percent less than the men, and that they directed their comments to the men rather than to other women, and were concerned about acceptance and relationships (Gordon & Strober, 1975).

The second major aspect of the professional male-female relationship is sexuality and how it influences the working situation. Here, too, there is little systematic

empirical evidence. Gordon and Strober (1975) deal with this issue, from a hypothetical standpoint, for managers; the themes here seem applicable to other professional areas. Their major contention is that sexuality inhibits male-female relations and women's ambition. They build their arguments in a theoretically sound way, but they have little evidence for documentation. One of their major points is the often-mentioned concept of "castration" applied to the aggressive or competent woman, with the implication that such a woman's intentions are to lessen the male's masculinity; as the authors suggest, one reason this perception may obtain is that many men equate their masculinity with job performance.

Another aspect of sexuality is the predominance of physical attraction; lacking that, the actual sexual component still exists in interactions with the opposite sex. One male manager was quoted: " 'I don't know whether it's right for me to act this way, or whether it makes me a Male Chauvinist Pig, but the first time I meet a woman, I respond to her as a sexual object and only later as a person' " (Gordon & Strober, 1975). Although all men and women may not have similar initial orientations, this aspect will surface in one way or another at some point in an extended professional relationship. Gordon and Strober's conclusion is that responding to "the sexuality of the other is the primary way men and women have learned to relate to each other," and that this carries over into the professional relationship, in which both sexes are locked "into reciprocal roles that have a semisexual basis." This dynamic ultimately limits the individual's potential by narrowing the range of behaviors. A good example of this is mentioned above in the research which found that women talked considerably less than men in a mixed-sex group.

Bunker and Seashore (1975) support this from their experience with men and women in groups. They say that when a man's first evaluation of a woman centers on her attractiveness, several reactions may ensue. If the reaction is negative, he may discount her and she will have difficulty being accepted for her role competence. If positive, he may test her seductively or he may withdraw because his sexual feelings interfere with a comfortable working relationship. Either reaction affects the job environment and raises questions about how the professionals should interact.

Gordon and Strober (1975) elaborated four types of role relationships which illustrate how women's competence is inhibited in male-dominated settings (and in which women collude). The four role pairs of the stereotypic relationships are (1) the *macho* and the seductress, primarily sexual, (2) the chivalrous knight and helpless maiden, primarily based on the perception that the male is responsible for the female, (3) the protective father and the pet, different from #2 in that the male is more active in his protection and the female's dependence is unlikely to be a means of manipulation, and (4) the tough warrior and nurturant mother, based on artificial self-sufficiency. This last, for the female, removes her from sexual competition, but often costs her in not being valued by men for her skills and her critical abilities; it also contributes to the stereotype of women as experts in emotional issues. These role constraints are not as much of a hindrance for men as for women, since women executives usually work with men and therefore their inhibiting roles are more likely to emerge.

Although the dysfunctional influences these constraints have on the achieving woman's behaviors and on male-female working relationships seem obvious, the hard data are not available for documentation. Bunker and Seashore (1975), who have worked on relationship problems with men and women in organizational settings, discuss the anxieties caused by the intimacy-sexuality issue. One way it is

manifested is in "ritualized sexual behaviors," which are verbal or non-verbal seductive messages dropped on top of another work-related message. This seductive collusion game becomes harmful when it affects decision-making and compliance with work requests. Another manifestation is a resistance to employment of women from men and their wives because of the threat of actual sexual relationships occurring. The potential for such an occurrence is a threat to the men, in that the opportunities increase; they also fear that the more assertive women will also become the seducers. For the professional women, anxiety may occur because of the threat of exploitation; also, if there are a large number of men who are testing the availability of women, the problem may be a constant source of irritation.

Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) comment that little is known about the cross-sex effects of boys and girls on their classroom performance. It is clear also that equally little is known about cross-sex effects of men and women upon each other's performance in the job situation. Similar questions can be asked in both situations. Do the women have a "gentling" effect on men? Do the men stimulate or depress competition, between the sexes or among the women? Is there a desire to impress the other sex, and does that impression take the form of achieving or lack of achieving? Does it expand beyond work-related activities? Understanding the cross-sex dynamics, particularly in the working sphere as they relate to productivity of all kinds, is necessary, especially in the long transitional period in which stereotypic sex roles give way to more androgynous roles for men and women.

Sex Differences in Job Duties, Job Styles, and Job Satisfaction

It is a truism among the literature on discrimination that women, even at the professional level, are given different assignments from men (less prestigious committee assignments, for example). There is some evidence, however, that women in general may choose different kinds of tasks. In a pre-1960 study of Minnesota faculty members (Eckert & Stecklein, 1971), women were reported as giving more time to teaching and services to student groups, whereas men gave more time to research activities, committee work and off-campus projects. This again may reflect the discrepancy between those behaviors toward which women are socialized, and those behaviors which are prerequisite for professional success. More recent data (Jacobs, 1972) showed that women law students preferred participation in a legal aid area; it was their choice to focus on job experiences which would provide personal satisfaction and a contribution to others, rather than focusing on more instrumental career factors. The men in the study (N=416) tended to prefer work in a private firm, while the women chose government and legal aid jobs more often.

Centra's (1973) data confirm these job activity differences. More women doctorates were teaching primarily (57% of the women, N=1343, vs. 46% of the men, N=1724), while more men were found in administrative and management positions (15% of the women, N=1343, vs. 26% of the men, N=1724). Similarly, the women doctorates reported a preference for teaching over research (32% of 1086 women, vs. 26% of 1212 men), whereas more men preferred research.

It appears that there may be some stability in the kinds of job tasks women prefer to do, and that sex differences may not all be a result of discrimination. Data on this issue are needed in areas other than the academic sphere.

Regarding actual styles of working on the job, the general tenor of the little research is that the differences are minimal and tend to follow the accepted differ-

ences in socialization patterns. Menninger (1972) says the following about the manner of women physicians:

> they have had one form of training which most men never get; I mean the training that most little girls receive in anticipating the wants of those about them, making visitors feel at home, and by tact, consideration, and charm, putting people at ease and drawing them out. . . . All these techniques which are used by the girl to attract love are useful in handling a frightened or belligerent patient.

The Fogarty, Rapoport and Rapoport (1971) "occupational studies" mentioned previously found several sex differences in jobstyles. According to their study, women supervisors tended to adopt a more permissive style of management, and they preferred posts where they could work on a one-to-one basis. They also found that women tend more than men to adopt an informal, personal, expressive work style. Women were reported more likely than men to be tense, self-conscious, conscientious over details, disinclined to delegate, and better at routine than at initiation. Their study is careful to point out that these differences do not spring from a fundamental capacity or approach, but from social shaping and adaptation to a minority situation. This perspective, that androgynous styles of job performance are developing according to the requirements of a particular position, seems to be an underlying theme of the practically-oriented current writing. An example of this is the management book by Gordon and Strober (1975).

Regarding the satisfaction of professionals with their jobs, Centra (1973) found that the overall satisfaction of the Ph.D.'s with their work was similar, but that the women doctorates tended to be less satisfied than the men with salary, rank, promotion, and job security. Eckert and Stecklein (1971) reported that about 20 percent of the male professors (N=509), but only 10 percent (N=197) of the female, were doubtful or would not again become college teachers if they were given a chance to remake the decision. Kashket et al (1974) concluded that women doctorates were not satisfied with their job positions; 30 percent of the married women with doctoral degrees (N=54) as opposed to only 15 percent of the married men (N=365) felt that their present position was worse than expected. Also fewer women (62%) than men (75%) at the doctoral level said that their present positions were commensurate with their abilities and in line with their future expectations ($p < .05$). The discrepancy between these two groups of women college teachers regarding their levels of job satisfaction may be due to social change and changed expectations during the ten-year span between the populations sampled.

Summary and Conclusions

A major problem with data on women's workstyles and careers is that current conclusions may not be tenable for the future, since the facts may change along with social change. However, the data do point to some current sex differences in career-related characteristics. Women in male-dominated professions have lesser ambition and lower commitment to their jobs than do men in similar positions. This fact cannot be left, however, without raising several issues that are related to it in important ways. First, studies on commitment and ambition use as dependent variables a range of measures from number of publications and hours spent working to a psychological orientation toward career importance. Although the constellation of all these dependent variables still points to lesser commitment for women than for men, more precise analysis may be obtained if women were given a "handicap" for number of years spent raising children, for example.

Related to the psychological orientation toward career, there are two issues:

first, are these women satisfied with their lesser ambition, or would they prefer to achieve a higher position if circumstances permitted it? If so, what would they prefer to be doing, and what psychological and sociological factors have deterred them from it? What characterizes those women who do achieve at the level of men, besides singlehood? The third issue is related to men; has their level of ambition been primarily induced by societal pressure to achieve, and if they had the chance, would many of them prefer to be more family rather than work-oriented? There is evidence that this phenomenon may have a real basis; *Ms.* recently published an article by a top-level executive who feared the consequences of refusing to accept a promotion (Kendall, 1975). In conclusion, that women in male-dominated professions appear to have had lesser ambition than men seems clear; the reasons for this, however, are not entirely clear, and the ramifications of it have not been explored, nor have any trends been documented.

The evidence on this group of women's relationships with other women is dominated by the Queen Bee syndrome of aloofness and hostility toward other women. This aloofness and extreme individuality may be explained partially by the very autonomous orientation needed to achieve in a male-dominated profession; such achievement cannot easily be based in a collective, non-competitive framework. The only contradicting data were on a group of black women professionals, who were supportive of their female colleagues. The development of supportive behaviors among these black women may be a crucial area for study; why do they lack the hostility that pervades the relationships among white female professionals?

No data were found on the relationship of women in high-level positions to those in subordinate positions, such as secretaries, or on their social relationships with women who are not professionals.

Their relationships with male professionals seem to be unquestionably dominated by their supportive function. Systematic research on this is lacking; there is a strong need for it, since theoretically the psychological implications of this role are far-reaching for both women and men. Equally influential, although more subtle and difficult to identify and deal with, is the issue of sexuality as a limitation on role behaviors in professional settings. Empirical evidence for this dynamic is as sparse as for the stroking function. Since both these phenomena are firmly engrained in the male-female relationships because of their strongly socialized basis, thus constantly affecting professional roles, the need for more investigation is apparent.

Women professionals have a tendency to choose different job tasks and to have different workstyles than men professionals, both tendencies appearing to conform to aspects of their sex-role stereotypes. It is important to realize that women's job tasks are not always a consequence of discrimination; equally important to understand is that their sometimes different manner of working may be at least as productive as the stereotypic male workstyles. If the trend is toward androgynous job-role qualifications, these issues seem to be relatively insignificant. Women professionals are generally satisfied with their positions, at least in the academic area; the exceptions pertained to the monetary and ranking aspects.

Chapter IV

Research Needs

Women's career behaviors have not been extensively considered in the counseling literature, primarily because "women as workers have been perceived as individually transient and collectively insignificant" (Vetter, L., 1973). Neither have the masculine-based theories of career development provided explanations or concepts to deal with women's special problems (Osipow, 1968). Two theories of career development and occupational choice for women (Psathas, 1968; Zytowski, 1969) have generated little research. Since women constitute about 38% of the labor force and 90% of all women will be employed at some time *(Twenty facts on women workers,* Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C., 1972), and since more women are entering the professions (Ginzberg & Yohalem, 1973), the need for a change is apparent in the orientation of career development and counseling theory, as well as research.

Emerging from the literature on women in male-dominated professions is an underlying, prevalent conflict between work role and sex role. This ultimately becomes a conflict between career and marriage. As Louise Vetter (1973) points out, counselors should be dealing with such multiple-role conflicts by helping to maximize individual development, rather than guiding women automatically toward acceptance of career goals as secondary.

At least three directions are necessary for research if women in professions, and those who have the potential to attain such positions, are to be understood and meaningfully counseled.

(1) Research needs to be related to theory. Psathas' (1968) theory of occupational choice for women has not generated any research (Vetter, L., 1973). Zytowski's (1969) theory is based on several untenable postulates, that is, vocational and homemaker participation are largely mutually exclusive. There just are no holistic perspectives on working women into which the odds and ends of research can fit.

(2) Research needs to document trends. Much of the research reviewed in this paper was obtained from samples which may not have begun to feel the full impact of the women's movement. Just what effects have those related events had on women of all ages regarding their vocational decisions? How large is the trend toward more participation in the professions, and why are the numbers increasing? What changes have occurred in the professional schools and work settings as a result

27

of increasing numbers of women, as well as changes in lifestyles, particularly attitudes toward marriage and child-rearing? (e.g., Is there a correlation between dual-professional couples and marriage contracts?) Investigation of such changes would help in counseling women toward creative solutions to the home-career conflict.

(3) Research needs to evaluate vocational guidance and counseling interventions. Regarding women in male-dominated professions in particular, answers are needed to questions such as: If women are exposed to more job alternatives, are they then more inclined to choose male-dominated careers? If they are exposed to courses or programs on such careers, or to more role models of professional women, are they more likely to choose such careers? Much of this kind of research may have to be longitudinal, but it is necessary to find what interventions are effective if women are to use their potential to the fullest.

28

References

Almquist, E.M., & Angrist, S.S. Career salience and atypicality of occupational choice among college women. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 1970,32, 242-247.

Angrist, S.S. The study of sex roles. *Journal of Social Issues*, 1969, 25, 215-232.

Bachtold, L.M., & Werner, E.E. Personality profiles of gifted women: Psychologists. *The American Psychologist*, 1970, 25, 234-243.

Bachtold, L.M., & Werner, E.E. Personality profiles of women psychologists: Three generations. *Developmental Psychology*, 1971, 5, 273-278.

Bachtold, L.M., & Werner, E.E. Personality characteristics of women scientists. *Psychological Reports*, 1972, 31, 391-396.

Bardwick, J.M. *Psychology of women: A study of bio-cultural conflicts.* New York: Harper and Row, 1971.

Bernard, J. *Academic women.* University Park, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1964.

Bernard, J. *Women and the public interest: An analysis of policy and protest.* Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1971.

Bunker, B.B., & Seashore, E.W. Power, collusion, intimacy-sexuality, support—breaking the sex role stereotypes in social and organizational settings. In A.G. Sargent (Ed.), *Beyond sex role stereotypes.* Cambridge, Mass.: West, 1975.

Cartwright, L.K. Personality differences in male and female medical students. *Psychiatry in Medicine*, 1972, 3, 213-218.

Centra, J. Women, men and the doctorate. Draft report 71-10. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1973.

Chesler, P. *Women and madness.* New York: Avon Books, 1973.

Deutsch, H. *The psychology of women.* New York: Bantam Books, 1973.

Eckert, R.E., & Stecklein, J.E. Academic women. In A. Theodore (Ed.), *The professional woman.* Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Co., Inc., 1971.

Epstein, C.F. *Woman's place: Options and limits on professional careers.* Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1970.

Epstein, C.F. Law partners and marital partners: Strains and solutions in the dual-career family enterprise. *Human Relations*, 1971, 549-564. (a)

Epstein, C.F. Encountering the male establishment: Sex-status limits on women's careers in the professions. In A. Theodore (Ed.), *The professional woman.* Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Co., Inc., 1971. (b)

Epstein, C.F. Positive effects of the multiple negative: Explaining the success of black professional women. In J. Huber (Ed.), *Changing women in a changing society.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1973.

Fairlie, H. On the humanity of women. *The Public Interest*, 1971, 23, 16-32.

Ferber, M., & Loeb, J.W. Performance, rewards, and perceptions of sex discrimination among male and female faculty. *American Journal of Sociology*, 1973, 78, 995-1002.

Fogarty, M.P., Rapoport, R., & Rapoport, R. *Sex, career, and family.* California: Sage Publications, 1971.

Ginzberg, E. et al. *Life styles of educated women.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1966.

Ginzberg, E., & Yohalem, A.M. (Eds.), *Corporate lib: Women's challenge to management.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973.

Goode, W. Family life of the successful woman. In E. Ginzberg and A.M. Yohalem (Eds.), *Corporate lib: Women's challenge to management.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973.

Gordon, F.E., & Strober, M.H. *Bringing women into management.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1975.

Graham, P.A. Women in academe. *Science,* 1970, 169, 1284-1290.

Harmon, L.W. Anatomy of career commitment in women. *Journal of Counseling Psychology,* 1970, 17, 77-80.

Hawley, P. Perceptions of male models of femininity related to career choice. *Journal of Counseling Psychology,* 1972, 19, 308-313.

Helson, R. Narrowness in creative women. *Psychological Reports,* 1966, 19, 618.

Helson, R. Sex differences in creative style. *Journal of Personality,* 1967, 35, 214-233.

Helson, R. Women mathematicians and the creative personality. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology,* 1971, 36, 210-220.

Hoffman, L.W. Early childhood experiences and women's achievement motives. *Journal of Social Issues,* 1972, 28, 129-156.

Horner, M. Fail: Bright women. *Psychology Today,* 1969, 3.

Horner, M. Toward an understanding of achievement-related conflicts in women. *Journal of Social Issues,* 1972, 28, 157-175.

Janeway, E. *Man's world, woman's place: A study in social mythology.* New York: Dell Publishing Co., Inc., 1971.

Janeway, E. Family life in transition. In E. Ginzberg and A.M. Yohalem (Eds.), *Corporate lib: Women's challenge to management.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973.

Jacklin, C.N., & Maccoby, E.E. Sex differences and their implications for management. In F.E. Gordon and M.H. Strober (Eds.), *Bringing women into management.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1975.

Jacobs, A.D. Women in law school: Structural constraint and personal choice in the formation of professional identity. *Journal of Legal Education,* 1972, 24, 462-472.

Kashket, E.R., Robbins, M.L., Leive, L., & Huang, A.S. Status of women microbiologists. *Science,* 1974, 183, 488-494.

Kendall, J.E. Down the up staircase. *Ms.,* August 1975, 31-32.

Komarovsky, M. Cultural contradictions and sex roles. *American Journal of Sociology,* 1946, 52, 184-189.

Komarovsky, M. Functional analysis of sex roles. *American Sociology Review,* 1950, 15, 508-516.

Komisar, L. The new feminism. *Saturday Review,* February 21, 1970, 27-30.

Kreps, J. *Sex in the marketplace: American women at work.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1971.

Lopate, C. Marriage and medicine. In A. Theodore (Ed.), *The professional woman.* Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Co., Inc., 1971.

Maccoby, E.E., & Jacklin, C.N. *The psychology of sex differences.* Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1974.

Maxwell, P.G., & Gonzalez, A.E. Traditional and non-traditional role-choice and need for failure among college women. *Psychological Reports,* 1972, 31, 545-546.

Menninger, K. The psychological advantages of the woman physician. *Bulletin Menninger Clinic,* 1973, 37, 333-340.

Osipow, S.H. *Theories of career development.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968.

Phelps, C.E. Women in American medicine. *Journal of Medical Education,* 1968, 43, 916-924.

Poloma, M.M., & Garland, T.N. The married professional woman: A study in the tolerance of domestication. *Journal of Marriage and the Family,* 1971, 33, 531-540. (a)

Poloma, M.M., & Garland, T.N. The myth of the egalitarian family: Familial roles and the professionally employed wife. In A. Theodore (Ed.), *The professional woman.* Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Co., Inc., 1971. (b)

Psathas, G. Toward a theory of occupational choice for women. *Sociology and Social Research,* 1968, 52, 253-268.

Rapoport, R., & Rapoport, R. Early and later experience as determinants of adult behavior: Women's family and career patterns. *British Journal of Sociology,* 1971, 22, 16-30.

Rapoport, R., & Rapoport, R. The dual-career family. In C. Safilios-Rothschild (Ed.), *Toward a sociology of women.* Toronto: Xerox Publishing Co., 1972.

Rich, A. Toward a woman-centered university. *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* July 21, 1975, 32.

Roe, A. *The making of a scientist.* New York: Dodd, Mead, and Company, 1952.

Rose, H.A., & Elton, C.F. Sex and occupational choice. *Journal of Counseling Psychology,* 1971, 18, 456-461.

Rossi, A.S. Barriers to the career choice of engineering, medicine, or science among American women. In J.A. Mattfeld and C. G. Van Aken (Eds.), *Women and the scientific professions.* Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1965. (a)

Rossi, A.S. Women in science: Why so few? *Science,* 1965, 148, 1196-1202. (b)

Shainess, N. Is anatomy destiny? Panel: The changing role of women psychiatrists. *JAMWA,* 1973, 28, 293-295.

Staines, G., Tavris, C., & Jayaratne, T.E. The Queen Bee syndrome. *Psychology Today,* January 1974, 55-60.

Tangri, S.S. Determinants of occupational role innovation among college women. *Journal of Social Issues,* 1972, 28, 177-200.

Tresemer, D. Fear of success: Popular, but unproven. *Psychology Today,* March 1974, 82-85.

Vetter, B. Female "role models" deemed important. *APA Monitor*, 1973, 3, 4.
Vetter, L. Career counseling for women. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 1973, 4, 54-67.
Zytowski, D.G. Toward a theory of career development for women. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1969, 47, 660-664.